

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

Vol. 71
No. 2
Summer 1976

<i>Ralph B. Levering</i>	John Hanson, Public Servant	113
<i>James Haw</i>	The Patronage Follies: Bennet Allen, John Morton Jordan, and the Fall of Horatio Sharpe	134
<i>Jean H. Vivian</i>	The Poll Tax Controversy in Maryland, 1770-76: A Case of Taxation With Representation	151
<i>Anne Y. Zimmer</i>	The "Paper War" in Maryland, 1772-73: The Paca-Chase Political Philosophy Tested	177
<i>Michael D. Clark</i>	Jonathan Boucher and the Toleration of Roman Catholics in Maryland	194
<i>Dale J. Schmitt</i>	The Capture of Colonel Moses Rawlings	205
<i>John M. Luykx</i>	Fighting for Food: British Foraging Operations at St. George's Island	212
<i>Edward C. Papenfuse</i>	An Undelivered Defense of a Winning Cause: Charles Carroll of Carrollton's "Remarks on the Proposed Federal Constitution"	220

Manuscript Notes

<i>Richard J. Cox</i>	A Checklist of Revolutionary War Manuscript Collections	252
-----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Reviews of Recent Books

Parker and Urnese , <i>The American Revolution: A Heritage of Change</i> , and Kegan , <i>Leadership in the American Revolution</i> , by James Kirby Martin • Davis , <i>The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823</i> , by Michael Mullin • Shaw , <i>The Character of John Adams</i> , by Constance B. Schulz • Lopez and Herbert , <i>The Private Franklin, The Man and His Family</i> , by Edwin Wolf 2nd • Ketchum , <i>Decisive Day: The Battle for Bunker Hill</i> , and Elting , <i>The Battle of Bunker's Hill</i> , by Paul David Nelson • Papenfuse , <i>The Pursuit of Profit: The Annapolis Merchants in the Era of the American Revolution</i> , by Norman K. Risjord • Earle , <i>The Evolution of a Tidewater Settlement System: All Hallow's Parish, Maryland, 1650-1783</i> , by Paul G. E. Clemens • Beitzell , <i>St. Mary's County, Maryland in the American Revolution: Calendar of Events</i> , by Bayly Ellen Marks • Yazawa , ed., <i>Representative Government and the Revolution: The Maryland Constitutional Crisis of 1787</i> , by John C. Van Horne	264
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Book Notes	280
Notes and Queries	282

The Patronage Follies: Bennet Allen, John Morton Jordan, and the Fall of Horatio Sharpe

JAMES HAW

ONE OF THE MOST CONSPICUOUS FEATURES OF MARYLAND'S COLONIAL POLITICAL system was the extensive patronage at the disposal of the province's proprietor, Lord Baltimore. By the 1760s the proprietor could appoint his friends or potential supporters to some ten major and seventy lesser civil offices, and he also controlled the selection of ministers for the forty-four parishes of the established Church of England. The most influential families of the province vied with one another for the leading positions of honor and profit. The use of the patronage allowed Lord Baltimore to build support for his government in the province, helped split the Maryland gentry into "court" or proprietary and "country," "patriot," or anti-proprietary factions, and constituted a frequent source of grievances that helped kindle the political attacks of the country party.

The use and abuse of the patronage also contributed significantly to the coming of the American Revolution in Maryland. The workings of the system at its inflammatory worst can be illustrated most graphically by following the Maryland careers of two of Lord Baltimore's favorites in the late 1760s, Bennet Allen and John Morton Jordan. The conduct of these two adventurers kept the proprietary administration in a state of turmoil for several years, led to the replacement of Governor Horatio Sharpe, aroused great popular discontent with Lord Baltimore's government, and served for a time to distract the province's attention from the simultaneously developing conflict over the Townshend Acts. In the end, both Maryland's own internal conflicts and the larger controversy between England and her colonies would merge into a single current that carried Maryland toward independence.

John Morton Jordan arrived in Maryland in May 1766. The Reverend Bennet Allen followed him in December. Their preferment was the most important result of the more active personal role that Frederick, Sixth Lord Baltimore, assumed in directing Maryland affairs for several years after the death of Secretary Cecilius Calvert in 1765. While Calvert lived, the playboy Frederick had left the administration of the province in his experienced hands. Now Baltimore and his new secretary, Hugh Hamersley, tried their hand at running Maryland. Their early results were not promising. Allen and Jordan between them managed to throw the proprietary administration into some disarray, and Allen's conduct

Dr. James Haw is an assistant professor of history at Indiana University-Purdue University at Ft. Wayne.

raised considerable opposition to Baltimore's abuse of his appointive powers.

John Morton Jordan, a London merchant engaged in trade with his native Virginia and "a particular acquaintance of Lord Baltimore," came to Maryland as a special agent of the proprietor to join with Governor Sharpe and Deputy Secretary Daniel Dulany in arranging the sale of His Lordship's manors and reserved lands. The three were also to perfect and put into operation a long overdue reorganization of the proprietary revenue system.¹ The principal problem in that system was lax supervision of the proprietor's financial affairs by Agent and Receiver-General Colonel Edward Lloyd III. A wealthy man with enormous land holdings and diverse interests of his own, Lloyd had neither the time nor the "Activity Adroitness and Method" necessary for the proper conduct of his official duties. Lloyd's remittances to London were irregular and invariably late, and his official affairs were confused. As early as 1755 Secretary Calvert had suggested that Lloyd might have to be replaced. But Lloyd would not voluntarily resign "an Office which he thought added to his Consequence" and Calvert was apparently afraid to risk alienating the influential man by dismissing him. In 1759 Sharpe hinted that Lord Baltimore had nothing to lose by ousting Lloyd, who could do no more damage out of office than he was already doing in office. Lloyd had formed extensive connections in country party circles and reportedly had given secret encouragement to their attacks on His Lordship's prerogatives. Nevertheless Lloyd remained in office.²

If Lloyd could not be removed, he would have to be placed under closer supervision. In 1759 Calvert proposed the creation of a Board of Revenue to oversee the administration of the proprietor's financial interests in the province. The scheme, considerably modified by Sharpe, was finally adopted in 1763. Lloyd was directed to tighten his collection methods, to build a receiver-general's office in Annapolis to house his records, and to submit regular accounts to a Board of Revenue composed of the governor, commissary general, secretary, attorney general, and judges of the land office for their review and transmission to the proprietor.

Implementation of the reform was agonizingly slow. Lloyd did not like the plan and dragged his feet. Calvert continued to complain about the agent's confused accounts and disobedience to his instructions. Lloyd particularly resented the prospect of being responsible to the Board of Revenue, which would include two men against whom he had law suits pending, Daniel Dulany and Land Office Judge George Steuart.³ When Jordan arrived in 1766 the Board still had not begun to function. Little wonder, then, that Lord Baltimore found it necessary to send a personal representative to Maryland to expedite the reform of the proprietary revenue system.

Upon Jordan's arrival in 1766, Jordan, Sharpe and Dulany immediately set

1. Hugh Hamersley to Horatio Sharpe, Feb. 20, 1766, in *Archives of Maryland*, ed. William Hand Browne et al., 74 vols. to date (Baltimore, 1883-), 14:266-67.

2. [H. Sharpe] to Philip Sharpe, [1768], Ridout Papers, Maryland Hall of Records, Annapolis (hereafter MHR), and to Cecilius Calvert, April 18, 1759, *Archives of Maryland*, 9: 328-29; Calvert to H. Sharpe, Dec. 23, 1755, and [March?, 1756], *Archives of Maryland*, 6: 324-25, 372.

3. Paul H. Giddens, "Land Policies and Administration in Colonial Maryland, 1753-1769," *Maryland Historical Magazine* (hereafter *MHM*), 28 (1933): 168-69; Calvert to H. Sharpe, Feb. 29, 1764, *Archives of Maryland* 14: 131.

about executing their commission. They spent two years auditing the agent's records and settling Lloyd's badly kept accounts. Meanwhile the plan for the future administration of the proprietary revenue was perfected, and the Board of Revenue at last became a reality on April 5, 1768. The completed reform reflected credit on all three commissioners, but in the process important frictions arose.

The most obvious conflict arising out of the commissioners' activities involved the wounded sensibilities of Edward Lloyd, who naturally did not take kindly to the inquiry into and settlement of his affairs. The disgruntled agent was determined to submit a dignified resignation at the earliest convenient moment. But tactless pressure from the commissioners made Lloyd's fall far more of a personal humiliation than was necessary. The leader in the attack on Lloyd was John Morton Jordan, whose "Anxiety to make him resign was very evident" to Sharpe. Soon after Jordan's arrival in Maryland, "he gave out that he was come to collect for His Lordship a vast Sum of Money that was due to him here from His Agent who as was hinted had no Inclination to part with it." In casting aspersions on Lloyd, Jordan found a ready second in Daniel Dulany. "As there had been a Difference of long standing between Colo[nel] Lloyd and Mr. Dulany," Sharpe reported, "the latter seemed rather more willing . . . to mortify the Colonel than was necessary." The Governor himself had no desire to hurt Lloyd but, reluctant to appear too favorable to the disgraced agent, he weakly went along with the policy of his fellow commissioners.⁴

All in all, Edward Lloyd III had to suffer through two very trying years. In the fall of 1766 Lloyd complained to Secretary Hamersley "of Reports he Imagines to have been Spread in the Province by Mr. Jordan to his prejudice." The agent, Hamersley thought, seemed to be "much hurt." When the audit was completed and Lloyd's resignation was called for in March 1768, Lloyd was quite ready to escape a most disagreeable situation. Withdrawing quietly and without public recrimination, Lloyd retired to his estate and maintained a frigid silence. He failed to attend the council sessions of 1768 and resigned from that body in November 1769, the year before his death. Shortly before his resignation Lloyd told Sharpe that he "was determined that none with whom he was intimately connected should ever be concerned" with Lord Baltimore's affairs again.⁵ And when Edward Lloyd IV entered public life in 1771 it was as an anti-proprietary assemblyman.

Even more significant was a growing rift between Jordan and Sharpe. Jordan's personality and his motives in coming to Maryland explain much of the hostility that developed between him and the governor. John Morton Jordan was an aggressive, self-important man on the make. The son of a Virginia schoolmaster, Jordan had gone to London and become a merchant engaged in the tobacco trade. But his position in the mid 1760s was somewhat precarious. His credit rating was not good, and his fellow London tobacco merchants did not think him worthy of membership in their club. Lord Baltimore's favor came as a godsend to Jordan, and he was determined to make the most of it.

4. [H. Sharpe] to P. Sharpe, [1768], Ridout Papers, MHR.

5. Hamersley to H. Sharpe, Nov. 8, 1766, and H. Sharpe to Hamersley, June 22, Oct. 30, 1768, *Archives of Maryland* 14: 346, 509, 546.

After his arrival in Maryland, Jordan sought to impress everyone with his own high standing in Baltimore's confidence. Sharpe said that Jordan even intimated to some of his Virginia friends that the proprietor had offered him the governorship. Emphasizing his own importance served a dual purpose for Jordan. It furthered his trading ventures by helping him extend his contacts in Virginia and establish lucrative new ones in Maryland, and it fortified his growing influence in court circles in the latter colony. Sharpe commented bitterly that "from his own Declarations and His Lordships friendly Letters to him [Jordan] which were very frequently exhibited Many considered him as the most fit Person to pay their Court in order to obtain Favour of His Lordship and really I don't think Mr. Dulany himself was at all backward."

Jordan's self-promotion challenged Sharpe's own influence and prestige. Though he avoided any indication of hostility at the time, Sharpe became ever more convinced that Jordan was not his friend. A clash in 1766 may have increased the ill feeling between the two men. Soon after Jordan's arrival he suggested that the commissioners direct Lloyd to pay the arrears from the agency into his hands for transmission to Lord Baltimore. Sharpe and Dulany refused, and the governor came to believe later that their rejection of Jordan's proposal "disconcerted him a little in a Plan he had laid for purchasing Tobacco here."⁶ Whatever the sources of their conflict, Sharpe was to receive clear proof in 1768 both of Jordan's hostility and of his influence. But by that time the insatiable demands of Baltimore's other favorite, Bennet Allen, had produced internal dissension and public conflict for Sharpe's administration.

The Reverend Bennet Allen was aptly described by his detractor Jonathan Boucher as "a man of some talents but no principles." Allen had attended Oxford before taking orders in the Church of England in 1761, and by 1765 he was well established in Lord Baltimore's good graces. Hamersley stated that the two had become fast friends through "a Similitude in their Studys," and indeed both Baltimore and Allen considered themselves poets of some ability. (English reviewers disagreed; one of them said that Allen's verses were "enough to make a dog howl.") Beyond that their common "studies" seem to have lain chiefly in the realm of wine, women, and dissolute revelry. At any rate, it was not long before the proprietor determined to provide through his Maryland patronage⁷ for his companion.

Baltimore at first contemplated keeping Allen with him in England, while giving the parson a parish in Maryland that could be looked after by a curate. Sharpe warned that the scheme would arouse great opposition in the province; Allen should at least come to Maryland to be properly inducted, after which he could return to England if he wished. But the warning was unnecessary. Lord Baltimore had changed his mind, and Allen sailed for the province with the intention of staying. He took with him orders from his patron that he should receive one of the best clerical livings in the province. If none of the most

6. H. Sharpe to Joshua Sharpe, June 10, 1769, and to P. Sharpe, [1768], Ridout Papers, MHR.

7. Jonathan Boucher, *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist*, ed. Jonathan Bouchier (Boston, 1925), pp. 54-55; Hamersley to H. Sharpe, March 28, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 474-75; Josephine Fisher, "Bennet Allen, Fighting Parson," *MHM*, 38 (1943): 300.

profitable parishes was vacant, Allen was to get two of the smaller ones until an opening occurred. Baltimore's unprecedentedly warm recommendations of Allen left no doubt that his preferment was to have the highest priority.⁸

Upon Allen's arrival Sharpe offered him his choice of the vacant livings in the province. Allen picked St. Anne's Parish, Annapolis, worth only about £180 sterling annually but considered the traditional steppingstone to advancement in Maryland's established church. There was a somewhat more lucrative opening on the Eastern Shore, but Allen preferred the capital to that remote area, probably because of its gay society and proximity to the governor, his key to further promotion. The governor reported home that he could not give Allen a second living, since provincial law forbade pluralities unless the two parishes involved were adjacent and both vestries consented.⁹

Allen's reception into prestigious court circles of Annapolis society was assured. Sharpe of course showed him every mark of respect and others followed suit. Daniel Dulany and his brother Walter were particularly successful in cultivating the parson's friendship. The Dulanys had not been overjoyed to see Allen arrive. Both had been seeking a minister for Annapolis who could also see to the education of their children, and they had recently found their man in Jonathan Boucher, an English-born Virginia minister who came highly recommended by their brother-in-law, the Reverend Henry Addison.¹⁰ Allen's preferment had blocked the Dulanys' plans to bring Boucher to Annapolis. But politics was politics, and Allen was obviously too close to Lord Baltimore to be slighted.

Cultivating Allen was at first not an unpleasant task. The fun-loving, irreverent minister could be a most pleasant companion, though as people came to know him better they found his tastes quite inappropriate for a man of the cloth. Allen's detractors later charged him with chronic drunkenness, though when pressed on the point one of them retreated slightly to the assertion that the parson was frequently tipsy. And if the later accusations of immoral conduct against Allen were not sustained by hard evidence, his loose and lascivious talk at least kept juicy rumors going. Then, too, Allen's condescending presumption of his own literary superiority over the rude provincials soon began to rankle.¹¹

Despite his good beginning and bright prospects, Allen was dissatisfied with his lot. Never one to wait patiently for a good opportunity, the parson made his claims to further favor known and began to cast about for ways of augmenting his income. His discontent brought a quick response from London. Hamersley wrote Sharpe in July 1767 to urge that Allen be better provided for, suggesting that a civil office might be found if "difficultys" barred his ecclesiastical preferment. The secretary did not specify just what he had in mind, and at that point understanding between London and Annapolis began to break down.¹²

Allen too was undoubtedly pressing Sharpe for further preferment, and the

8. Lord Baltimore to H. Sharpe, Aug. 2, Sept. 22, 1766; H. Sharpe to Baltimore, Dec. 7, 1766, *Archives of Maryland* 14: 323, 329-30, 350-51.

9. H. Sharpe to Baltimore, Mar. 1767, *ibid.*, p. 373.

10. Aubrey C. Land, *The Dulanys of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1955), p. 281; Boucher, *Reminiscences*, ed. Bouchier, p. 54.

11. "C.D.," *Annapolis Maryland Gazette*, May 19, 1768; [H. Sharpe] to P. Sharpe, [1768], Ridout Papers, MHR.

12. Hamersley to H. Sharpe, July 20, 1767, *Archives of Maryland* 14: 405.

governor's resistance was beginning to weaken. Acutely conscious that any apparent reluctance to serve Allen would be held against him in London but equally aware that awarding the parson a second clerical living might produce an explosion in Maryland, Sharpe faced a most difficult dilemma. In July he repeated to Hamersley his misgivings about a second parish for Allen but added that "if Mr. Allen is willing to make a Tryal and His Lordship pleases" the attempt would be made.¹³

In the same letter Sharpe reported to his superiors that he had made two significant appointments to high civil offices. Daniel Dulany's brother Walter had become commissary general and George Plater naval officer of Patuxent. In each instance Sharpe believed he was fulfilling the wishes of the proprietor, and indeed he had been given no reason to think otherwise. But his action produced consternation in London. Hamersley wrote in November that Lord Baltimore had intended to bestow one of those positions upon Bennet Allen. The proprietor would not risk alienating Dulany or Plater by undoing what Sharpe had done, but the governor was sternly reprov'd and cautioned that Baltimore "desires your Excellency will not for the future Dispose of any Civil Employs, in favor of any particular Persons, till his pleasure be previously known, and where they cannot be kept Vacant for a sufficient time, that you will put them in Commission to such Persons, who can pretend to no further Claims, and to whom a Subsequent Negative may be safely given."

As for Allen, Hamersley expressed Baltimore's disappointment that nothing more had been done for the parson. "By no means would his Lordship involve you or himself in any Disputes about Pluralitys," the secretary cautioned. If Allen could not be advanced in the church, he should be given a civil office. Then followed the instruction that ultimately resulted in a fatal misunderstanding between the proprietor and his governor:

The Impropriety of the Receiver's holding the Keepership of the Rent Roll (which was intended as a Constitutional Check upon him) has now turned his Lordships Eyes to that Employment, and to that or any other now Vacant, or which may become so, either in Consequence of any Resignation of Mr. Loyd, or of any new regulations to be proposed by the Commissioners, or by any other Accident his Lordship desires and expects Mr. Allen may be immediately Promoted, and the better it is and the sooner it reaches him, his Lordship will be the better pleased, for he has very much and deservedly engaged his Lordships attention and regard.¹⁴

Allen too was unhappy with Sharpe's appointments. The parson's jealousy of Walter Dulany's promotion opened a rift between them that later hardened into enmity. Holding Sharpe responsible for Dulany's preferment, Allen also began trying to undermine the governor with Lord Baltimore. In August Allen wrote Baltimore that His Lordship's government obviously was not succeeding. "The fault," Allen added, "either lies in the constitution or the administration."¹⁵ Outwardly, of course, Allen continued to cultivate Governor Sharpe.

13. H. Sharpe to Hamersley, July 27, 1767, *ibid.*, p. 414.

14. Hamersley to H. Sharpe, Nov. 10, 1767, *ibid.*, pp. 432-34.

15. Bennet Allen to [Baltimore], Aug. 27, 1767, Calvert Papers, MS. 174, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore (hereafter MHS).

Sharpe received Hamersley's injunction of November 1767 to avoid a contest over pluralities too late. Even before Hamersley's letter was written, Sharpe had yielded to Allen's pressure and opened a Pandora's box of trouble for all concerned. Allen's big break came with the death in October 1767 of the rector of St. James's Parish at Herring Bay, some sixteen miles from Annapolis, which returned an annual income of £300. Allen immediately applied to Sharpe for the position, and against his better judgment the governor gave him a license to officiate there as a curate. At Allen's suggestion, the governor withheld a formal induction of the parson in the hope that he could thus collect the income of both parishes without raising the issue of pluralities. But Sharpe warned both Allen and Baltimore that if the vestries should contest Allen's right to the poll tax for the support of their ministers "he will I apprehend be sorry to have made the Experiment." Allen's response was typical. He assured Sharpe "that no Stir will be made about the Affair and intimated to Me that if the Assembly should concern themselves he supposed my telling them that what had been done had been done by your Lordship's Instruction would be a sufficient Answer to them."¹⁶ Allen never understood that Lord Baltimore's powers in Maryland were less than absolute. Imperious, headstrong, and determined to make his fortune quickly in spite of all obstacles, the parson simply would not listen to good advice.

Allen now set about clearing the way for his induction as rector of St. James's as well as of St. Anne's by obtaining the consent of both vestries as the law required. Early in November he sought out Samuel Chew, a member of the St. James vestry and a stepbrother of the Dulanys. Allen told Chew that if the vestry approved his induction, he would appoint a curate for St. James's who would be removed at any time the parishioners desired. The prospect of having such control over his church's minister appealed to Chew, who promised to support Allen's cause before the vestry. The other vestrymen were at first opposed, but they finally succumbed to Allen's persistent pleas and approved the parson's induction on the condition that he agree to a list of terms they would later draw up.¹⁷

Allen next went to work on the vestry of St. Anne's. Walter Dulany was a member of that body, and Allen turned to him for support. Despite a legal opinion from country party lawyer and politician William Paca favoring Allen,¹⁸ Dulany refused to endorse Allen's application for permission to hold two parishes. Supported by the opinion of patriot attorney and delegate Thomas Johnson, Dulany believed the parson's design to be illegal since the two parishes, while close together, were not strictly adjacent as required by law. Walter Dulany advised Allen not to make the attempt, but the angry minister would not listen. Already displeased by Dulany's appointment as commissary, Allen now fastened on Walter Dulany as his principal enemy.

Dulany was not present at the next meeting of the St. Anne's vestry, but his

16. H. Sharpe to Baltimore, Oct. 29, 1767, and to Hamersley, Nov. 3, 1767, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 425, 429.

17. Samuel Chew, *Ann. Md. Gaz.*, June 2, 1768.

18. Allen to H. Sharpe, Nov. 25, 1767, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 457.

absence proved no advantage to Allen. Brice Thomas Beale Worthington, an influential patriot assemblyman, led a strong opposition to Allen on the vestry. Allen found the atmosphere at the meeting so unfriendly that he decided not to put his request for approval of the plurality to a vote. The thwarted favorite "immediately attributed his Miscarriage entirely to Mr. Dulany."¹⁹

Despite the setback Allen was "fully persuaded he shall by some means or other be able to carry his Point." His first thought was to remove the obstacle posed by Walter Dulany. Without informing that gentleman, Allen called a meeting of the St. Anne's vestry and told the startled vestrymen that they were to elect a successor to Dulany, who as a councilor was ineligible to serve on the vestry. That board refused to act without hearing Dulany's reply, and Allen was foiled again.

Allen's conduct had by that time aroused precisely the popular issue that Sharpe had dreaded. Annapolis patriots were outraged at the attempt to override the law and the wishes of the people in order to satisfy an undeserving proprietary favorite. The governor feared that the vestries would challenge Allen's right to the income of one or both parishes and that Johnson and Worthington would get the assembly to pass resolutions against the parson. Sharpe predicted "that this Spark will alone be sufficient to kindle a new Flame in the Country that will not soon be extinguish't."²⁰ The governor was quite right, and chief incendiary Allen soon provided more than just one spark.

St. James's Parish again became the center of attention. Its vestry's conditional consent to accept Allen was proving tremendously unpopular. Nor did the imprudent parson help his cause when he remarked jocularly to one vestryman that the parish's £300 income "will hardly supply me with Liquors."²¹ (Comments of that nature were at least partly responsible for the worst rumors about Allen's character.) Samuel Chew had soon come to regret his earlier promise to support Allen. On January 6, 1768, Allen stopped by Chew's house on the way, as he said, to rent out the St. James Parish glebe. Chew told the parson that he had no right to do that, as the vestry's consent to his holding the parish had been only provisional. Chew said that the vestry would never confirm the agreement and Chew would oppose Allen in the future. A heated altercation ensued when Allen accused Chew of bad faith and said that Walter Dulany's influence was responsible for changing his stepbrother's mind. Chew swore on his Bible that Dulany had nothing to do with his change of mind, but Allen still doubted his word. Chew exploded and threw the parson out of his house. Allen then challenged Chew to a duel. Chew, hearing that Allen would carry a sword cane as well as his dueling pistols, brought along a servant with a blunderbuss to ensure fair play. Allen got wind of the blunderbuss and failed to show up. Or so they said. Perhaps neither was really too eager to fight. The altercation caused

19. Allen to H. Sharpe, Nov. 25, 1767, and H. Sharpe to Baltimore, Feb. 9, 1768, *ibid.*, pp. 457-58, 464-65; "A Plain Dealer," *Ann. Md. Gaz.*, March 3, 1768.

20. H. Sharpe to Hamersley, Nov. 27, 1767, Feb. 11, 1768; to Allen, Nov. 26, 1767, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 460-61, 467, 459-60; and to P. Sharpe, [1768], Ridout Papers, MHR; "A Plain Dealer," *Ann. Md. Gaz.*, March 3, 1768.

21. Chew, *Ann. Md. Gaz.*, June 2, 1768.

quite a sensation, though Lloyd Dulany may have exaggerated a bit when he reported that as far away as Boston Chew was "idolized" as an heroic opponent of ecclesiastical tyranny.²²

There was now not the slightest possibility that either vestry would approve Allen's venture in pluralities. Public opinion was inflamed against the minister; Samuel Chew wrote that the issues raised by Allen's conduct "will be jest as good as the Stamp Act for some."²³ Just what Allen expected to gain by carrying the battle into the newspapers is therefore not clear, but that is what he did. On January 28 Allen, disguised as "A Bystander," asserted in the *Maryland Gazette* that councilors could not serve as vestrymen, basing his argument on the interesting grounds that English peers were exempted from vestry duty. The publication accomplished nothing except to touch off a four-month newspaper battle between Allen and his critics. The most important facet of the controversy was Allen's ill-advised declaration that "Pluralities are tenable by *Laws*, the Effect of which no Act of Assembly in this Province, can *ever* invalidate." Allen did not choose to elaborate publicly, but Sharpe reported that the statement "at once interested in the Dispute All the Vestries and Numbers of warm People throughout the Province."²⁴ The patriots found a popular new issue in Allen's violent behavior and his high-handed disdain for the law of the province. But Allen still had not learned that the people's rights were not to be taken lightly.

In fact, the parson still had hopes of prevailing over his enemies. After the St. Anne's vestry turned down his bid for a plurality, Allen addressed to Sharpe a lengthy letter attempting to prove that the ecclesiastical laws of England were in full force in Maryland. Lord Baltimore was the head of the Maryland church and thus was invested with all the ecclesiastical powers of the king of England. And among those powers was the right to grant dispensations from the laws regarding pluralities. The proprietor's instruction that Allen be given two parishes would therefore override the act of assembly forbidding the practice. Allen falsely told Sharpe that he was sure Lord Baltimore knew the true state of affairs and agreed with his favorite's contentions. The argument proved successful. Again with deep misgivings, Sharpe gave Allen an induction into St. James's in spite of the popular opposition.²⁵

Had Sharpe held out a little longer he could have avoided granting the second induction. Hamersley's letter of November 1767 advising Sharpe to avoid the issue of pluralities by giving Allen the office of receiver-general, rent roll keeper, or any other office made available by the reorganization of the proprietary revenue system apparently reached Maryland in February 1768. Allen, who had been expecting directions to give him a position in the revenue department and who

22. *Ibid.*; H. Sharpe to Baltimore, Feb. 9, 1768, and "State of the Difference between Mr. Allen and Mr. Chew," *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 464-65, 465-67; Lloyd Dulany to [Walter Dulany?], Mar. 27, [1768], Dulany Papers, MS. 1265, MHS.

23. Chew to H. Sharpe, Jan. 12, 1768, Dreer Collection, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

24. "C.D.," *Ann. Md. Gaz.*, Feb. 25, 1768; "A Bystander," *Ann. Md. Gaz.*, Feb. 18, 1768; H. Sharpe to Hamersley, April 1, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 486.

25. Allen to H. Sharpe, [Dec. 1767 or Jan. 1768], and H. Sharpe to Hamersley, Feb. 11, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 437-56, 467.

had in fact suggested the idea to Baltimore to begin with, promptly chose the agency, the highest and most profitable available office. Edward Lloyd resigned that office on March 25, and Bennet Allen became His Lordship's agent and receiver-general. At the same time he resigned as rector of St. Anne's, thus hopefully ending the conflict over pluralities. The other post vacated by Lloyd, that of rent roll keeper of the Western Shore, Sharpe gave to Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer contingent on the proprietor's approval. Major Jenifer, a wealthy Charles County planter and merchant, had of late come to head Sharpe's personal list of deserving applicants for office.²⁶

Allen, still not satisfied with the status he had attained, learned in early May that the Reverend Thomas Bacon, highly respected rector of All Saints Parish, Frederick County, was near death. This large and rapidly growing frontier parish was the richest clerical living in the province, and Allen had long had his avaricious eye on it. It was common knowledge that the parishioners intended to petition for a division of All Saints upon Bacon's death, but Allen had been combating that plan for more than a year in order to preserve the full benefits of the living for himself. Allen requested Sharpe to give him an induction into All Saints before the petition could be presented. Immediately upon the incumbent's death Sharpe did just that.²⁷

The parson arrived in Frederick on Tuesday May 31 to take possession of his new parish. All was quiet until Saturday morning, when the town received copies of the *Maryland Gazette* containing the latest anti-Allen article by "C.D.," which was probably the pen name of Walter Dulany. According to Allen, "private Letters recommending all kind of Violence even to Murder" against him were also included in the mail. The parson suspected that his parishioners intended to prevent him from conducting his induction ceremony. His own account of what ensued is substantially accurate:

I saw the Storm and anticipated it. On Saturday I got the Keys went into the Church read Prayers the 39 Articles and my Induction. On Sunday having heard that the Locks were taken off and the Door bolted within I got up at four oclock and by the Assistance of a Ladder unbolted them getting in at a Window and left them on the Jar. I went at 10 oclock and found all the Doors and Windows open. The Vestry came up to me and spoke of Breach of Privilege [Allen not having shown them his induction or any other authority for his taking over]. I said I am not acquainted with Customs I act by the Letter of the Law. The moment the Governor signs an Induction, Your Power ceases, I am sorry that any Dissention etc. I saw they drew to the Doors of the Church. I got a little Advantage leap't into the Desk and . . . begun the Service. The Congregation was called out. I proceeded as if nothing had happened till the Second Lesson. I heard some Commotions from without which gave me a little Alarm and I provided luckily against it. . . . they called a number of their Bravest that is to say their largest Men to pull me out of the Desk. I let the Captain come within two Paces of me and clapt my Pistol to his Head. What

26. H. Sharpe to Hamersley, Feb. 24, 1768, and to Baltimore, Mar. 31, 1768; Allen to H. Sharpe, Nov. 25, 1767, *ibid.*, pp. 469-70, 479-80, 458; Allen to [Baltimore], Aug. 27, 1767, Calvert Papers, MS. 174, MHS; H. Sharpe to Hamersley, Oct. 30, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 546-47.

27. [Allen to Baltimore], Feb. 1767, Calvert Papers, MS. 174, MHS, and to H. Sharpe, May 8, 1768, and H. Sharpe to Baltimore, May 15, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 494, 498.

Consternation! they accuse me of swearing by God I would shoot him, and I believe I did swear, which was better than praying just then. They retired and I proceeded, but the Doors and Windows flying open and Stones beginning to Rattle my Aid de Camp Mr. Dakein advised me to retreat, the Fort being no longer tenable. We Walk't thro the midst of them facing about from time to time till we got some Distance when Stones began to fly. . . .

The barrage continued until Allen surrendered the church keys. The parson was then allowed to escape, and he fled to Philadelphia. "This I have the Dulany's to thank for," Allen raged.²⁸

In September 1768 Allen renewed his attack on Walter Dulany in the *Pennsylvania press*, charging the commissary with raising a mob against him in Frederick and seeking to ruin him by all means fair and foul. Dulany indignantly appealed to the governor for an investigation of the charges. Sharpe called a council meeting for October 10 and notified Allen that he would be expected to produce the evidence to substantiate his accusations. The parson, who of course had no proof, replied that he was under no obligation to appear and did not intend to do so. The final episode in the Allen-Dulany feud took place in November, when the two men brawled publicly on the streets of Annapolis. Walter Dulany, although he was "a heavy, gouty, and clumsy man," thrashed Allen soundly.²⁹

By that time Horatio Sharpe had been replaced as governor of Maryland. The immediate circumstances surrounding the decision in July to replace Sharpe are somewhat unclear, but the key figure was certainly John Morton Jordan.

The reorganization of Lord Baltimore's revenue system was essentially completed by the spring of 1768. The sale of the proprietary manors was underway, though it was not going particularly well; Lloyd's accounts had been audited and the agent himself superseded; and the Board of Revenue was ready to begin operations. Jordan was now ready to report back to London. He left Maryland toward the end of March for Virginia and probably sailed from that province for England in late April or early May. Soon after Jordan reported to the proprietor, things began to happen. Jordan had promised that they would.

Before his departure from Maryland Jordan "express't Dissatisfaction in several Counties and gave Intimations that People here may soon after his Return to London expect a considerable Revolution." Sharpe may not have learned of Jordan's threats immediately, but when he did he quickly sought to counter them. The governor wrote Hamersley requesting that he be given a fair chance to exonerate himself from any "Insinuations to my Disadvantage" that Jordan might make. He also notified his brother Philip in England of the situation so that Sharpe's friends might bring their influence to bear if necessary. But the governor's supporters were not powerful enough to save him. The two Sharpe brothers who had been closest to Lord Baltimore, John and William, were

28. Allen to H. Sharpe, June 6, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 501-3; "A Parishioner of All Saints," *Ann. Md. Gaz.*, Sept. 1, 1768; Allen, *An Address to the Vestrymen . . . of All-Saints* (Philadelphia, 1768), pamphlet, MHS; W. Dulany to Hamersley, Sept. 29, 1768, Dulany Papers, MS. 1265, MHS.

29. W. Dulany to H. Sharpe, Sept. 26, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 530-31; Fisher, "Allen," *MHM*, 39 (1944): 51-52; Boucher, *Reminiscences*, ed. Bouchier, p. 55.

both dead. So of course was Cecilius Calvert. "When You lost my Lords Uncle You lost your best Friend with his Lordship," another of Sharpe's brothers told the governor.³⁰

Jordan's influence, on the other hand, proved to be immense. Lord Baltimore, obviously impressed with the performance of his favorite, made Jordan a gift on July 15 of Conococheague Manor and Reserve, containing some 18,000 acres and worth at least £18,000 sterling. Jordan was elevated to the new office of Supervisor of His Lordship's Accounts, Lands, and Revenues for Maryland, which involved supervision of the Board of Revenue and of all the proprietor's property interests in his province. In August one of Jordan's Maryland factors, George Lee, was appointed surveyor general of the Western Shore, a sinecure that successive governors had held for more than fifty years.³¹

If Jordan needed any help in ousting Sharpe, reports from Maryland furnished him with plenty of ammunition. By early July the proprietary circle in London knew of Bennet Allen's appointment as agent and his induction into All Saints, but apparently had not yet heard of Allen's tumultuous reception in Frederick. Baltimore and Hamersley were very angry with Sharpe for having conferred the agency on the parson. The proprietor would have been happy to have Allen as rent roll keeper, as he had indicated, but apparently Hamersley's sweeping directive of November 1767 to give the minister "that or any other" office that might become vacant by Lloyd's resignation was not intended to extend to the agency. The secretary's vagueness had led Sharpe into a serious misunderstanding of his superiors' wishes. Lord Baltimore knew his favorite well enough to be quite certain that he did not want to have Allen in charge of collecting his revenues. The proprietor was "surprized and displeased at the hasty Appointment," Hamersley told Sharpe on July 18. "His Lordship never entertained the least Imagination of Conferring the first Employ in the Province, an Office of all others the most interesting to himself which required an intimate Knowledge of the Country and of every Law and every Branch of the Revenue . . . upon a Stranger newly come into the Country (however he might be attached to him) in preference to all his antient Tenants many of whom he is satisfied are possess't of All the Qualifications requisite for the Employ."³²

Hamersley ordered Sharpe to remove Allen as agent and replace him with—of all people—Matthew Tilghman, who had been a country party leader ever since his brother Edward was fired as rent roll keeper of the Eastern Shore in 1755. Sharpe's friend Major Jenifer was to be removed as rent roll keeper in favor of Reuben Meriwether. In addition Tilghman and his son-in-law Charles Carroll, Barrister, another leading opponent of the proprietary administration, were to be offered seats on the governor's council. Sharpe was not completely surprised at the favor shown to the two patriot leaders in direct contradiction to long-standing

30. H. Sharpe to Hamersley, May 27, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 500-1; to P. Sharpe, [1768], and J. Sharpe to H. Sharpe, Aug. 6, 1768, Ridout Papers, MHR.

31. H. Sharpe to Hamersley, Oct. 23, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 534; Giddens, "Land Policies," *MHM*, 28 (1933): 171; H. Sharpe to [Gregory Sharpe], Dec. 10, 1768, Aubrey C. Land, ed., "The Familiar Letters of Governor Horatio Sharpe," *MHM*, 61 (1966): 199-200.

32. Quoted in H. Sharpe to Hamersley, Oct. 30, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 544. Only a fragment of the original letter has survived.

policy against rewarding country party members. Tilghman and Carroll, dissatisfied with their London tobacco correspondents, had given their business to Jordan's company. Sharpe had suspected from the first that the arrangement might have political implications. He naturally attributed the appointments to Jordan's influence.³³

Hamersley's letter to Sharpe on July 18 apparently gave no indication that the governor was to be superseded. By that date, however, the decision was all but made. Joshua Sharpe had heard a report to that effect from a reliable source on July 9. The report was confirmed on July 20, when Hamersley wrote Sharpe that the governorship would be given to former Coldstream Guards officer Robert Eden, who had married Lord Baltimore's sister Caroline. The official explanation for the change was simply that the proprietor had been prevailed upon to provide for his brother-in-law, who "had by extravagant Living and Gaming run himself into such Streights and Difficulties that he could not well continue longer" in England. Hamersley and Baltimore both expressed complete satisfaction with Sharpe's performance.³⁴

Eden's friends had been "working incessantly" to procure the governorship for him ever since Secretary Calvert's death in 1765. Despite the official explanation, however, Lord Baltimore's dissatisfaction with Sharpe's recent actions in appointing Walter Dulany commissary and George Plater a naval officer, in approving Allen's request for a second parish, and in giving the agency to Allen opened the way for Eden's success. Where the parson was concerned Sharpe simply could not win. Sharpe's efforts to remain in favor in London by serving Allen seemed to lead only to misunderstandings with the proprietor and trouble in Maryland. And although Sharpe favored Allen far beyond his own inclinations, he constantly feared—with much reason—that his qualms about granting Allen's "unreasonable" demands were being represented to Baltimore by the favorite as a reluctance "to fulfill His Lordship's pleasure."³⁵ Sharpe had tried very hard to please, but everything had gone wrong.

Finally there was the role of John Morton Jordan. It is impossible to say just what Jordan told Baltimore about Sharpe, but it seems clear that Jordan considered Sharpe a hostile rival for influence in Maryland affairs who had to be eliminated. Both Sharpe and his brothers were sure that Jordan's "alpowerful" influence with Baltimore was instrumental in the change, and they seem to have been correct. Benjamin Galloway, a young Marylander studying in England, wrote home that Jordan boasted publicly in London of having placed Eden "in his station of governor."³⁶

33. Hamersley to H. Sharpe, July 18, 1768, and John Morton Jordan to H. Sharpe, Aug. 16, 1768, *ibid.*, pp. 512–13, 524; [H. Sharpe] to P. Sharpe, [1768], Ridout Papers, MHR; H. Sharpe to Baltimore, Oct. 31, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 551.

34. J. Sharpe to H. Sharpe, July 9, Aug. 6, 1768, Ridout Papers, MHR; Hamersley to H. Sharpe, July 20, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 515–16.

35. J. Sharpe to H. Sharpe, Aug. 6, 1768, Ridout Papers, MHR; H. Sharpe to Hamersley, Oct. 23, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 537; H. Sharpe to [G. Sharpe], Dec. 10, 1768, Land, ed., "Familiar Letters," *MHM*, 61 (1966): 200–1.

36. P. Sharpe to H. Sharpe, Aug. 29, 1769, Ridout Papers, MHR; Benjamin Galloway to John Galloway, April 8, 1769 (filed under 1774), Galloway, Maxcy, Markoe Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

The chief beneficiaries of the turnover were Jordan, Eden, and to a lesser extent the Dulanys. According to Sharpe, Daniel Dulany had managed to stay in the good graces of John Morton Jordan. That gentleman's help was invaluable to the Dulanys in removing the possible dangers to their position that arose from their quarrel with Allen. Jordan, Sharpe believed, had "turned the Scale" of proprietary opinion in favor of the Dulanys. Allen was dropped from favor and the Dulanys received "Letters of adulation" from Hamersley. In addition the Dulanys had lost a mildly hostile governor—they had not gotten along well with Sharpe—and gained an unknown but potentially friendly one. Sharpe wrote bitterly to his brother that

the Messrs. Dulanys seem to have the game in their own hand and tis reported that Letters from London say Mr. Jordan had hinted that Captain Eden would be particularly recommended to them. This in my opinion is not very well judged for however great Mr. Daniel Dulany's Talents may be Captain Eden should on his arrival wish to be considered as free from all Influence and Prejudices. . . . If Mr. Jordan preserves the ascendancy he has at present over My Lord I shall never be sorry that I am dismissed so early in his Ministry, for I should have thought it dishonourable to serve under his Controul or Direction.³⁷

Sharpe did not leave office immediately, however. Robert Eden assumed the governorship only on June 6, 1769. It was thus left to Sharpe to carry out the other changes in the disposition of offices that were ordered in July 1768. To Sharpe's surprise, Tilghman and Carroll declined their appointments. Having made their fortunes and risen to leadership of the patriot faction, the two probably had no desire to sacrifice their popularity by identifying themselves with the increasingly despised proprietary government.

Sharpe then asked the Board of Revenue whether Allen should be retained as agent. Before answering, the board decided to ask Allen for an accounting of the funds he had received and the remittances he had made to the proprietor. The parson refused on the ground that his instructions required him to make an accounting once a year at a specified time and the board had no power to demand his accounts in the interim. Allen's impertinence sealed his fate. On November 25, 1768, he was superseded by Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer. But the provincial administration was still not rid of Allen. The parson would not give up his official papers to Jenifer. He stated that he bore a commission directly from the proprietor and that the governor had no right to remove him. "It is evident," Allen contended, "that the same power that gives can alone take away. . . . My Lord orders me to resign to Mr. Tilghman whom he has appointed. His Lordship has not ordered me to resign to Mr. Jenifer, whom he has not appointed." Only after the board ordered Allen's bond as agent put in suit did he agree to wind up his accounts, and only in 1771 were those accounts satisfactorily closed.³⁸ The

37. H. Sharpe to [G. Sharpe], Dec. 10, 1768, Land, ed., "Familiar Letters," *MHM*, 61 (1966): 201-2.

38. Allen to H. Sharpe, Nov. 29, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 559; Minutes of the Board of Revenue, Nov. 21, 1768 to June 6, 1771, *ibid.*, 32: 411-68. Lord Baltimore had sent a blank commission for Allen in 1767, leaving it to Sharpe to fill in the appropriate office. This was the basis of Allen's claim to have been commissioned directly by the proprietor.

confusion caused by Allen's tenure as agent thus largely offset for a time the salutary effects of the reform of the proprietary revenue system.

Jenifer was destined to be disappointed once again in his hopes for high office. Lord Baltimore did not approve his appointment as agent, preferring to give that office also to John Morton Jordan. But by the end of 1769 Jordan was not a well man. He resigned shortly before his death in 1771. The wily Jenifer, whose unfailing conviviality and talent for political intrigue as well as his very real ability secured him as high a place in Eden's regard as he had held in Sharpe's, regained the office and this time held it.³⁹

Thus the activities of Allen and Jordan affected decisively the careers of a number of important Maryland politicians. But the affair had an impact on Maryland that went far beyond its immediate consequences, and any account of the controversy would be incomplete without an attempt to indicate briefly its long-range significance for the coming of the American Revolution in Maryland. That in turn requires that the Allen-Jordan affair be viewed in the twin contexts of the perennial issue of church reform, and of the larger conflict between Britain and her colonies.

There had long been considerable recognition in Maryland and elsewhere of the need to provide better discipline and tighter organization for the Church of England in the colonies. That issue again came to the fore in Maryland after 1767 because the impact of Bennet Allen's conduct was reinforced by other simultaneous troubles in the province's established church. Maryland's Anglican clergymen were a very mixed lot, some quite good and others very bad, and not surprisingly the latter sort tended to get more than their share of attention. The Reverend Thomas Chandler, visiting the lower Eastern Shore in 1767, informed the Bishop of London that the "general character of the Clergy" there was "most wretchedly bad. It is readily confessed that there are some in the province whose behaviour is unexceptionable and exemplary, but their number seems to be very small in comparison, they appearing like here and there lights shining in a dark place. It would really, my Lord, make the ears of a sober heathen tingle to hear the stories that were told me by many serious people, of several Clergymen in the neighbourhood of the parish where I visited, but I still hope that some abatement may fairly be made on account of the prejudices of those who related them."

The 1767-68 crop of scandals involving clergymen was particularly large. Parson Richard Brown of St. Mary's County had lived outside his parish for more than three years without providing a curate and had recently been accused of murdering one of his slaves. Brown fled to Virginia until the only potentially damaging witness against him—his son—could be packed off to Scotland, then returned and was acquitted for lack of evidence, although he ceased to officiate in his parish. Reverend Neill MacCallum (or McCullum) of Dorchester was an alcoholic unable to perform "any part of his Duty." Another minister was "said to be not only an habitual Drunkard but also to live in Adultery." Probably no other Maryland clergymen at that time were so bad, but Sharpe reported that

39. Donnell Maclure Owings, *His Lordship's Patronage: Offices of Profit in Colonial Maryland* (Baltimore, 1953), p. 168.

several others were not conscientious in discharging their duties.⁴⁰

Given the deficiencies of many of Baltimore's clerical appointees it was natural that the people of Maryland should come to desire far-reaching reforms in their established church. The Reverend Chandler discovered that many Marylanders "look upon themselves to be in a state of the cruelest oppression with regard to ecclesiastical matters. The Churches are built and liberally endowed, entirely at their expense, yet the proprietor claims the sole right of patronage, and causes induction to be made without any regard to the opinion of the parishioners; those who are inducted are frequently known to be bad men even at the time, and others soon shew themselves to be so after induction." Yet there was "no remedy," since not even Baltimore himself could remove an inducted minister. By 1768 some Marylanders were beginning to voice the conviction that the parishioners, not the proprietary, should have the power of ecclesiastical preferment.⁴¹

Popular discontent over church affairs exploded in the winter of 1767-68 among the parishioners of Coventry Parish in Somerset and Worcester counties. The parish had had no inducted minister and had been served by a curate since the death in 1766 of Nathaniel Whitaker, "who by his Sottishness and immoral Behaviour had long been considered as an intollerable Burthen by the Parishioners." About the time that Allen publicly raised the issue of pluralities, the vestry of Coventry adopted the radical idea that each vestry had the right to choose its parish's minister, as was the practice in Virginia. The vestrymen asserted "that they would not admit any Rector unless of the Parishioners Election." Sharpe immediately countered by inducting one Mr. Ross into the parish, but the threats of the parishioners caused Ross to give up without even going to Coventry Parish. The governor then gave the living to Philip Hughes, a stalwart former army chaplain who was not easily frightened. Hughes took with him an opinion from Daniel Dulany refuting the vestry's claim, and for a time all was quiet. But opposition to Hughes did break out and continued at least into 1769. Despite threats, mobs, and rumors of mobs, Hughes stayed.⁴²

It was evident to almost everyone that some supervision of the clergy was needed to correct the abuses arising from unfit ministers. Some of the parsons, led by Jonathan Boucher (who finally got St. Anne's Parish from Eden), favored the establishment of an Anglican bishop for the colonies, an idea which had long been in the air throughout America and in England as well. Lord Baltimore opposed that idea as an infringement on his ecclesiastical prerogatives. In 1768 both houses of assembly passed a bill creating a board, composed of the governor and three clergymen and three laymen appointed by the governor, which was to

40. Rev. Thomas Chandler to Bishop of London, Oct. 21, 1767, in William Stevens Perry, ed., *Papers Relating to the History of the Church in Maryland, A. D. 1694-1775* (Privately printed, 1878), pp. 334-35; H. Sharpe to Hamersley, June 22, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 507; Proceedings of the Lower House of Assembly, June 22, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 61: 410-11.

41. Chandler to Bishop of London, Oct. 21, 1767, Perry, ed., *Papers Relating to Church*, pp. 334-35; Chew to H. Sharpe, Jan. 12, 1768, Dreer Collection, Hist. Soc. Pa.

42. H. Sharpe to Baltimore, March 31, 1768, and to Hamersley, April 1, May 15, Oct. 30, 1768; Outerbridge Horsey to H. Sharpe, Oct. 15, 1768; Philip Hughes to H. Sharpe, Dec. 16, 1768, June 13, 1769, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 480-81, 488, 498, 533, 560-63.

have power to discipline or remove clergymen accused of wrongdoing or neglect. Sharpe personally favored the proposal but felt compelled to lay the bill aside until the proprietor's will was known. The delegates let it be known that "they will push the Bill every Sessions till they obtain it," and they ultimately succeeded. Governor Eden signed a similar measure into law in 1771, but apparently the board never functioned.

Sharpe commented in 1768 that Allen's doings and "the bad Conduct of some among the Clergy" had made the ministers and their relatively high salaries "more thought of lately than every they were before."⁴³ The ill repute into which the clergy had sunk was to have important consequences in the early seventies. The expiration in 1770 of the provincial law regulating the ministers' salaries and the fees charged by officers of the civil government for their services furnished the occasion for the patriots' discontent with the proprietary patronage system to burst forth in a sweeping attack against Lord Baltimore's administration.⁴⁴

The most significant feature of the officers' fee controversy of 1770-74 was the application of English Commonwealth ideas to the internal government of the province. Eighteenth-century Commonwealth thinkers, whose political views were widely popular in America, stressed the dangers which they believed the English ministry's use of patronage to corrupt and control Parliament posed to the liberty of Englishmen throughout the empire. The Stamp Act and Townshend Acts had appeared to confirm the reality of those dangers, and by 1770 the belief that England was confronted with ministerial tyranny based on the corruption of representative institutions through the use of the patronage was firmly rooted in the minds of many Americans.⁴⁵

Maryland too possessed an extensive and expensive patronage system which Lord Baltimore and his "ministers" used to uphold and extend their political influence in the province. After 1770 Marylanders realized that the analysis of the Commonwealth writers, which they had used to define the threats posed by the Stamp and Townshend Acts, applied to their own provincial politics as well as those of the empire. Once the link had been made, Lord Baltimore's government could be seen as not simply corrupt, but actively dangerous to liberty in Maryland in much the same way as was the government of England itself. The Allen-Jordan affair, by serving as an object lesson in the abuses of patronage and thus helping kindle the discontent that led Maryland patriots to make that link, had an impact far beyond its temporary disruptive effect on the province in the late 1760s.⁴⁶

43. Charles Albro Barker, *The Background of the Revolution in Maryland* (New Haven, Conn., 1940), pp. 358-62; Rev. Hugh Neill to Bishop of London, Sept. 20, 1768, Perry, ed., *Papers Relating to Church*, pp. 337-38; H. Sharpe to Baltimore, June 23, 1768, *Archives of Maryland*, 14: 510.

44. For the officers' fee controversy, see the author's article, "Maryland Politics on the Eve of Revolution: The Provincial Controversy, 1770-1773," *MHM*, 65 (1970): 103-29.

45. Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), pp. 22-159.

46. For a fuller explanation and documentation of this thesis, see the author's "Politics in Revolutionary Maryland, 1753-1788" (Ph. D. diss., University of Virginia, 1972).